



Sustainable Solutions
by
Mike & Annie Lunn

2400 NW Century Drive
Prineville, Oregon
97754
541-447-7671
"mcalunn@bendnet.com"

**Accelerating Cooperative Riparian Restoration and
Management**

Workshop for the Coordination Network

Reno, Nevada May 15-17, 2001

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

PROCESS INTRODUCTION	Page 3
GROUNDING	3
GREETING CIRCLE	4
CREEKS AND COMMUNITIES: PANEL	4
DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION	4
WORST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES	7
BEST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES	9
LIVING A JOURNEY: WAYNE ELMORE	13
BELIEFS, BEHAVIORS, STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS	14
ROUND ROBIN FROM STATES	14
NEW AND ADAPTIVE STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS	16
SHORT TERM AND LONG TERM ACTIONS	19
FINAL SHORT TERM ACTIONS	24
FINAL LONG TERM ACTIONS	26

THE CIRCLE

IF YOU:

LISTEN WITH RESPECT....

UNDERSTANDING,

TRUST,

LEARNING,

A NEW TRUTH,

GROWING,

RESOLVING,

ADAPTING

WILL RESULT.

Tuesday, May 15:

Large Circle Introduction of Process - The purpose of the introductory activities by the facilitators was to help the group become accustomed to listening, and starting to bring a focus to the meeting by discussing the purpose and process.

Large Circle Grounding - Each person was offered the opportunity to answer the following three questions in turn, going around the large circle:

“Introduce yourself and your relationship to accelerating cooperative riparian restoration?”

What are your expectations for this meeting?

How do you feel about being here?”

This is a simple grounding task that does the following:

- Establishes a model for listening with respect, a knowing that each person will be heard.
- Establishes a verbal territory for each participant, a sense of potential equity.
- Requires access to both the left and the right brain, engaging the “whole brain”.
- Allows apprehensions and hopes for the meeting to be expressed.
- Allows participants to express hidden agendas (like leaving early, a flat tire, sickness).
- Brings people into the “here and now”.
- Provides initial information to the facilitator.

Grounding is an important activity to start any meeting with. We all come to meetings with some measure of apprehension or uncertainty about what will happen. Grounding allows this apprehension to be stated.

Thinking uses stored knowledge from which you can draw on, such as your relation to the riparian restoration. Feeling brings us an awareness of how we are now, internally, with our emotions. Sensing makes us aware of what is going on externally. Each brings us in the “here and now”. Each “grounds” the person.

Thinking	=	Past or future
Feeling	=	Present, here and now, internally
Sensing	=	Present, here and now, externally.

THINKING/FEELING/SENSING ARE ALL ATTRIBUTES THAT YOU WILL USE IN SEEKING CONSENSUS.

Break into Small Groups (divided by occupation/affiliation/interest) – In this activity, we distributed people into diverse small groups of 8-10 people. We did this by honoring the representatives of the various groups and agencies present, and having them count off 1-5; then move to their new small circles.

Greeting Circle – To further establish relationships, we conducted greeting circles in the small groups. For people in conflict, this can be a powerful activity.

- The greeting circle establishes the opportunity for all participants to meet each other, friends as well as strangers.
- It allows the anxiety and apprehension of the individuals to be confronted, encountered. It releases energy into the room, in the sound of high voices, laughter, slaps on the backs, hugs.
- It allows people to meet the person, in place of the role, or stereotype. As a result, it reduces the intimidation that people tend to perceive with each other.
- It opens up communication, allowing each person to seek a common interest or topic. It provides a basis for knowing people. It establishes a sense of community.
- By being both a “greeter” and a “greeted person”, the concept of balance is introduced. This causes the individuals to go beyond the ritualistic first greeting, to finding a more real and common interest.

The greeting circle should only be used however, when accompanied by the following “Lifelong Learning” activity.

Lifelong Learning – In the small circles, each person in turn answered the following two questions:

How did it feel to be in the greeting circle?

What did you learn from the greeting circle that could help you work better with agencies and communities?

Creeks and Communities: The Importance of Working Together - A panel of the following people addressed the larger group: Rob MacWhorter, Steve Borchard, Bob Lohn, Randy Randall, and Corrie Baraclough. They were asked to give broad insights into their approaches to collaboration, regional and national trends they observe related to the Initiative, activities of the new Administration, and other topics. Their purpose was to be catalysts to start thinking about the Initiative for Accelerating Cooperative Riparian Restoration and Management, and how it fits in the larger context of restoration.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITUATION

In the small circles, each facilitator asked people in his/her group to answer the following questions in turn:

“What is the situation with the effort to Accelerate Cooperative Riparian Restoration and Management?”

“How did it get that way?”

“How do I feel about the situation?”

While each person spoke, other group members were asked to listen with respect.

Recorded Description of the Situation – The facilitators designated a recorder to write to the flip charts the answers to the following questions. The answers were first recorded on 3x5 cards, then read to the group and recorder. The first question was recorded from all participants first, then answers to the second question were recorded.

“How did I hear the situation with the effort to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration described?”

“How did I describe the situation?”

Collective Statements on the Situation

The answers of the individuals were first derived in list form. Later that evening, collective statements were developed, in which the individual answers were joined in paragraph form to better put in context the answers from the group. Words shown *in italics* were added to provide better linkage and clarity.

Collective Statement: **“How did I hear the situation described regarding the Initiative to Accelerate Cooperative Riparian Restoration?”**

There is a history of war stories *regarding* use of PFC. *Nevertheless* PFC is a groundwork but where do we go from here and how do we move forward? There is a lot of anxiety about the use of PFC *and* if PFC is used improperly *it may* fail as a technique. PFC is a technique, not an endpoint *and* more emphasis from agency leaders is necessary to support this technique.

If PFC is not working, the process needs to evolve, perhaps to a new level. Presently the initiative is stalled and in some cases is moving backward. *Thus* we find ourselves at a point of reassessment *and* we need a new approach. *Developing a new approach requires* more involvement by top management. Management needs to be interested in accelerating cooperative riparian restoration. *This* effort should be reworked at various levels *and* we need to see improvement on coordination and leadership for the program. *Further*, reorganization and a new emphasis is needed.

The initiative is experiencing the 7-year itch...and a new strategic objective is needed. Coordinated riparian restoration is fragmented, *characterized* by implementation of specific projects related to stream and riparian habitat. *There is* much variation from state to state *and although* a cooperative riparian strategy is progressing on the ground it is patchy. *In fact*, there are no examples of completed/comprehensive watershed management to draw from. There is disparity between technical knowledge and management application. *We* need a common technology and understanding *of* existing initiatives so we don't reinvent them needlessly.

There are a variety of ways, from agencies accepting improper procedures to the process being misused, as the process has been viewed. It's laid a foundation, there is interest in the evolution *of the process* but where do we go from here? We need to move to what comes after PFC.

People (*resource managers and others*) are overwhelmed with workload and feel further removed from riparian management. *We* need to integrate the riparian initiative into other resource management programs. *This may be difficult* because people are discouraged. Initial riparian fixes and team enthusiasm are being replaced by failures

on the ground and declining agency support of individual efforts. *We are* at a crossroads. *We need to* re-evaluate riparian strategy and need to integrate with other programs.

Optimism/Frustration – The process has had success nationally and internationally.

It's a "popcorn" effect... we have successes but they are uneven and scattered. It is frustrating and confusing at some levels to "all is well" at other levels. Strong commitment to the process has resulted in frustration because people care so much. We have had progress and awareness, but there has been some difficulty with carryover (continuation).

Although there is frustration, people are also feeling optimistic. Cautious optimism and new opportunities *exist*. Optimism and pessimism are both present but much more optimism regarding the ultimate outcome. Mixed descriptions *were heard* of the situation: scattered, dedicated, motivated, frustrated and hopeful. The situation has been described as disparate, lacking coordination, but founded in a lot of hard work that is based on the commitment to riparian recovery and this is motivated by an optimism that has grown out of knowledge of where we have come from.

Collective Statement: **"How did I describe the situation with the Initiative for Accelerating Cooperative Riparian Restoration?"**

We need to incorporate the riparian program into other programs because successes and failures of the program are not generally known. Some states, in particular Wyoming, have many examples of successful local collaborations with different expectations, and there is a disagreement between technical splitters and managerial lumpers. On the other hand, successes remain the exception, not the rule in Nevada. And while new players are learning there are common ties nationally, there are some major differences between the East and the West.

Better collaboration between agencies is needed on watershed level projects. While some State cadres are strong, others are struggling. We need a collaborative step towards resource conservation. Potential audience is still very large.

Options need to be local, workable and incentive based. And the process will move ahead on people who choose to stay ahead. The new administration puts an emphasis on local involvement. Nationally and internationally I have witnessed a steady increase in cooperative efforts. For this to continue, we need to find the right people in the right places to join the effort. The potential for success is great.

It will work but it is going to take some time; we need to be patient.

Accomplishments are great, but we need a new direction. Greatest demand is among RCD's, watershed groups. There are Benefits associated with basic education in stream function; PFC is a tool that can be effectively used. There is also a need for comprehensive watershed scale examples.

There are too many priorities on managers and the publics. The Initiative competes with a lot of existing programs. Some states are not taking a proactive position. Methods do exist, but the Federal family needs FTE and financial resources to empower locals. BLM needs to take a proactive role in engaging private landowners. But agency budgets also need to address the collaborative processes.

Qualitative not quantitative; we need to focus on the problems, not the symptoms. We are currently at a transitional period where implementation of the process is lacking and a change in the role of the cadre/team needs to be reviewed.

Even though progress has been made, there needs to be a change of focus in areas to revitalize the initiative. Efforts are fractured. We need to improve the integration with fish and wildlife program areas. It's time to reassess the approach and pick a more effective strategy.

There is a wide range of frustration over the lack of collaboration, common vocabulary, consideration of cost along with benefits and commitment of members. There is also a need for consolidated efforts on the intermix of private and public land, as whole watersheds (not just a "popcorn" approach). We also need to go beyond PFC and identify DFC.

WORST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

The small groups identified Worst Possible Outcomes, by looking at the possibilities in two different ways. Two groups answered the question about the WPO if we move ahead spending time and money similar to the current situation. Three groups looked at the WPO of not investing time and money while moving ahead.

What is the worst possible outcome from spending time and money trying to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration?

What is the worst possible outcome from not investing time and money trying to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration?

The answers to these questions were recorded, and later made into collective statements.

Collective Statements on the Worst Possible Outcomes

Collective Statement: **"What is the worst possible outcome from not spending time and energy to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration?"**

Deterioration of Resources

Failure to spend time and money will cause deterioration of our valuable riparian resources and a growing animosity between interest groups, government agencies and the public. Ecologically, *it would cause* the loss of riparian dependent species and water quality; socially the loss of intangible values associated with riparian areas. Desertification will continue at an accelerated pace. Degradation and depletion of natural resources would result in a decreased quality of life. Degradation of the quality of life *would occur*: - deterioration of riparian condition, - degradation of fish and wildlife

habitat, - decline in quality and quantity of water. When the creeks are gone it will be too late.

Process

Lack of consistency in use of different tools *will result*. *We* will re-invent the wheel over and over. Wayne would have to look for a new job. Dollars may be wasted if everyone is doing their own thing and ultimately *we* lose the natural resources. *There would be* loss of learning process for improving the collaborative approach, *and* no pooling of valuable input from diverse perspectives to address riparian issues. Riparian restoration will proceed at a slower, less organized rate without the process to promote cooperation and consensus. *We would see* even more spotty activity (wider dispersal pattern.) Each agency and landowner *would be* duplicating effort and wasting resources. *There would be* hot spots even more scattered and largely ineffectual. *There would be* addiction to technological fixes in the short term, *and* the borg and the loss of our souls in the long term. Fresh water *would be seen* as the strategic resource and the root cause for war.

Financial Inefficiency

***There would be* inefficient use of already limited manpower and funds in restoring riparian areas, waffling, piecemeal projects, and potential for disparate results.** Some people will spend money on band-aid approaches that fail. The worst outcome is that the needed improvements will be much more expensive and perhaps impossible to achieve, if deferred. *People* will continue to encroach on riparian areas with the associated loss of water storage, flood control and water quality. More dollars *will be* spent on FEMA, CWA, etc., etc., with less effect. Progress will be retarded and some work in place and investment will be lost; riparian conditions will get worse. People will get more frustrated and hopeless; water quality and water quantity problems will worsen.

***It would have* minimal effect on riparian restoration.** Temporarily reduced coordination between agencies *would occur*. Progress will continue and something will fill the void. Wayne will have to find a real job!

Loss of Momentum

Agency management driven by political directives and crisis control results in poor planning, which leads to misallocation of project funds and implementation that actually contributes to riparian degradation. Losing the momentum which was gained on the backs of others *could result*. Do you want to live in Rome? *There would be* loss of initiative, *replaced by* top down mandates. Goals and objectives between agencies decrease public trust. All of the hard work and understanding about riparian function and recovery could be lost and our efforts compromised. Poor land use practices continue (or begin anew) and yet no one understands why the streams are unraveling.

Litigation

We lose more of the environmental and social resources resulting in more regulations mandated by and expanding urban population and more lawsuits by litigants. We would lose opportunity before court/legislative actions take over resulting

in loss of resources. More gridlock and paralysis would result in threats of litigation and continued/increasing distrust and animosity. Courts and lawyers would “manage” the land – possible violence over outcomes.

Collective Statement: **“What is the worst possible outcome from spending time and money trying to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration?”**

Applied projects would negatively shift *the* health trend of riparian areas *causing* alienation of the cooperators, resulting in failure to improve resource conditions *that* will destroy public confidence in our ability to achieve ecosystem health and prove to be a big waste of public funds.

We make a lot of commitments *that* we don’t carry through on, thus hurting our credibility with the public. We fix the site but we don’t change the behaviors that cause the problems in the first place, *so* that on the ground projects would fail and we would give up. *For example*, the almighty energy development plows ahead with no regard for riparian protection.

This leads to long-term abandonment of the program without it being incorporated into other resource programs. Federal and State regulators regulate in spite of good work and case history of success. If only symptoms are tackled, and money is spent on “quick fixes”, then resulting failures *occur*. *A worst possible outcome is* that it doesn’t work and we are still unable to perform successful on the ground restoration. It doesn’t work, leaving us where we started *and* things continue pretty much as they have been.

Not spending enough time and money, time and money constraints will get in the way of the approach; *however* some of the best collaborative efforts have required little money and time. Other opportunity costs *and* the lack of understanding of what is to be accomplished *results in* nothing being done. “If we don’t know where we want to go, we’ll never get there.”

I don’t have an answer. I’ve tried to think that way, but I can’t. There is no such thing as a worst outcome.

BEST POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

Just as worst possible outcomes reflect one possibility, so do the best possible outcomes. We ended the first day by answering the question:

“What is the best possible outcome from investing time and money trying to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration?”

Collective Statement on Best Possible Outcomes

Collective Statement: **“What is the best possible outcome from investing time and money trying to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration?”**

PFC is a common tool in the early stages of locally led watershed planning.

More agencies and groups join the effort. Expanded cadres/teams actively promote understanding of stream functions. Increased understanding leads to more and better watershed based planning and implementation. Agencies, private groups and individuals approach riparian/wetland ecosystems in a common understood manner. A paradigm shift to less structures and wiser land use *develops*. Urban dwellers become aware of the role of riparian areas. Entire communities become involved in positive riparian management, Identifying and meeting of riparian objectives that will fulfill the values of the community and if not a consensus with others, values at least a real understanding.

Most people understand how riparian areas function and make decisions for sustainability of healthy streams and wetlands. People at the local level collectively take the responsibility for the initiative and “T” find a new job. Society understands the processes that must be *present* in order to provide and/or sustain the values we prize.

Riparian areas are recognized for their full range of values and are restored to their PFC across the Nation. Water stays on the land longer, our systems evolve to meet their potential, remain self-sustaining; and Phoenix/Las Vegas keeps their hands off of it *because of* society-wide value of healthy riparian systems. There will be no water wars. Watershed outcomes will be based on collaborative local efforts that produce abundant wildlife and fish, high quality water, sustainable services & systems, and adaptable, resilient communities.

Riparian restoration is effective, widespread & self-sustaining. It is economically viable, socially acceptable, & ecologically sustainable. The process becomes truly collaborative, riparian areas improve, traditional land uses and livelihoods are maintained for generations *because of* people working together on a common vision.

A comprehensive approach to riparian restoration and recovery is developed, understood and supported by our institutions and publics and provides established long-term protocols that ensure continuation of riparian restoration efforts at all levels: field →international. This is not a one-point-in-time for-all-the-creeks approach. Coordination of agency, institution, organization effort *results in a* clear interagency vision that everyone understands and supports. *It will be a* collective effort by private, State, and Federal entities to improve, enhance/restore riparian/wetlands leading to functional sub-basin watersheds. Lasting partnerships continue to build upon the foundation already established, leading to an enhanced conservation ethic and restoring riparian areas beyond the band-aid fix.

There are long-term benefits to affected natural resources, “local” socioeconomic situations and inter/intra agency/public relations fostering successes of other resource concerns. The public values healthy resource conditions and actively/positively manages their activities in sustainable ways *and* builds and expands on existing successes and progress toward restoring riparian areas and connecting watersheds using the collective knowledge and experience gained through collaboration – most successes begin with a success. Connected networks of healthy optimally

functioning riparian ecosystems *spread* across the nation before it's too late. Riparian restoration is happening on the ground. Publics and user groups are fully engaged in the process ensuring effectiveness and efficiency with funds and resources.

Most or many riparian areas are eventually restored and/or maintained at optimal levels; social commitment has evolved/developed to insure continued future success. People will work together; good riparian management will become “catchy” *and* riparian areas will store water longer. *There will be* long-range riparian system health. The process will become self-sustaining and we will restore all the degraded streams and prevent future degradation *knowing* that it works and the health of the water catchments improves. *There will be a* balance of good physical condition of riparian systems with biological conditions and human values. Human relationships reflect this positive condition of riparian areas.

***There will be* many successes, lessons from failures, “can do” attitude, and a sense of community in tackling resource management and other problems; development of a land ethic, functioning and resilient streams, watersheds and communities.** Ecological and economic sustainability is achieved and sustainable. *There will be* harmony on the land among the various resource users *and* healthy functioning watersheds and the realization of most sustainable uses. All public and private entities will share the same vision as regards restoration and we have anadromous fish runs that make everybody happy. *There will be* more shade for cows and fish (if they behave themselves), *and* no more endangered species – aquatic, terrestrial, or human. Birds will sing, cows will graze, fish are abundant. People wonder why was there ESA and CWA? Lawyers will have to go back to ambulance chasing. None of us would need jobs in the field anymore. The birds would sing, the fish would swim, and all is right in the watershed.

.....In wildlife is the preservation of the world.

.....

***Insights for Worst and Best Possible Outcomes**

***WORST/BEST/POSSIBILITY**

Worst Outcomes: These are feared future outcomes, often based on past experience, with a presently experienced emotion and physical reaction. When people believe them, they affect their perceptions, beliefs, values, and strategies. They tend to be self-fulfilling prophecies when strongly held.

Best Outcomes: These are hoped for future outcomes, sometimes not experienced previously, but intensely imagined, with a presently experienced emotion and physical response. When people believe them, they affect their perceptions, beliefs, values, and strategies. They tend to be self-fulfilling prophecies when strongly held.

Possibility Thinking: An acknowledgement that both the worst and best outcomes are present and inherent in each moment, up to, and often after the event. This balanced view allows the movement toward desired outcomes.

In this task, we explore the fears and the hopes of the participants. It is more important to explore the worst fears before the best hopes. Fears are uppermost in the minds of those who are apprehensive, uncertain, unwilling. It is normal and right to fear the worst outcome of any situation. For nearly all people, it is an unconscious, autonomic reaction. As an example, think of a time when you were sleeping and the phone rang very early in the morning. What did you think? What did you feel?

How about the time you saw a child run toward the road? How did you react? Did you yell to him and demand he stay away from the street? Even though there may have been no cars there, you experience the worst possible outcome ---THE CHILD BEING HIT BY A CAR! Not only that, you feel the potential emotion of that moment just as if it was happening.

In such a way, people fear the worst outcome of any situation and operate emotionally out of that fear just as if it were really happening. This is a major motivator for most conflict.

Once your fears have been adequately expressed, then your hopes seem more possible, easier to express and believe. Following this with the Best Possible Outcomes leaves the images and words of the best hopes in the minds of all the participants. **This is the image that should guide their thoughts and behaviors during the workshop.**

All events/issues have a potential worst or best outcome. Either is possible. Typically, some of us choose to focus on either the worst or the best outcome (pessimist/optimist). When these views become pitted against each other, we tend to see the worst outcome or the best outcome as the exclusive possibility. This results in polarization of views. Even if we refuse to think in terms of the worst possible outcomes, we must realize that others do. If we are in our best outcomes and they are in their worst outcomes, there can be no meaningful communication.

The best outcome is often not experienced by people in conflict because they get focused on talking about the worst possible outcome. Rarely does anyone acknowledge their worst outcome as a possibility only, so that they can move to the best outcome.

The best outcome is just as possible as the worst outcome. It is a way of expressing the potential in any event or issue. It is a goal, a direction, that all people can agree to seek. It focuses on the positive efforts of people who are seeking the best. Consensus and problem solving recognizes the possibility of the worst and the best outcome.

“It’s a fact that the sun will rise tomorrow. It’s a possibility that I will be here to see it.” Both worst and best outcomes are only possibilities until we work to make them real. And we usually have a choice.

At the end of the first day, assignments were made for people to develop the collective statements.

Wednesday, May 16:

Living a Journey – Wayne Elmore

Wayne provided an informative and insightful talk about the evolution of the Initiative and explained the context of riparian and watershed restoration in relation to problems faced on both a national and global scale. A copy of his talk can be found on the NRST website.

Collective Statement Review - The groups who developed the collective statement last evening were asked to present them to the large group. Collective Statements on the Situation and Worst/Best Possible Outcomes were presented.

Discussion – There was quite a bit of discussion about the contents of the collective statements, and also about worst and best possible outcomes. Some people felt they couldn't deal with worst possible outcomes, or that they were overstated. Others felt the best possible outcomes in part were unachievable and unrealistic. Mike noted that the Best Possible Outcomes would be the purpose toward which we formulated Strategies and Actions.

Beliefs, Behaviors, Strategies and Actions – Mike led a discussion of these important concepts that are critical to moving towards achievement of the Best Possible Outcomes.

***Insights for Beliefs, Behaviors, Strategies and Actions**

*** FOSTERING THE BEST OUTCOMES**

Once the best outcomes have been established, then is the time to develop the movement to make them happen. Fostering the best outcomes will often require looking at beliefs, behaviors, strategies, and actions. Each of these is a different focus:

Belief: A conviction or opinion. These create the behaviors of the person.

Behavior: Deportment or demeanor (a person's manner towards others). These are manners and attitudes that are created by the basic beliefs of a person.

Strategy: A plan or broad, inspecific action. (we could get into lots of semantics here, just go with it.) A strategy is intended to carry out a vision or mission. It is also a way of actualizing a belief. Strategies are often developed that are incongruent with the person's beliefs. The behaviors will then override the intent of the strategy.

Action: The act, process or fact of doing something. These are the specific deeds that carry out the intent of the strategy. If they are not congruent with the person's beliefs, they will be nullified by the person's attitudes and demeanors.

We are used to focusing only on action plans, or strategies. This is appropriate if the change is one of modification, where the current beliefs are already congruent with the plan. If the beliefs are not consistent with the plans, they will not be carried out. The behavior will tend to be incongruent with the action. In this instance, the new and adaptive beliefs must be agreed to. This is one of the most common causes of failure within the agencies. Think of the initiatives, plans, and great ideas that are passed down from on high, with no attempt to change the beliefs and behaviors of the people who are charged with implementing them. And sometimes, we see a lot of lip service from people throughout the ranks to things that sound good or make them look good. But unless all the levels (beliefs, behaviors, strategies, and actions) are congruent, it “ain’t gonna” happen.

Round Robin from States and BC – Representatives from the 11 western States and others provided information about the status of their programs; the good, the bad, the needs, and the ideas for the future. These presentations ran the gamut from very little happening, to some folks/areas who were really moving things ahead.

Group Discussion – One question was asked which engendered considerable discussion, and I think was one of the critical points in the meeting because of the thinking and responses that were elicited. Russ Lafayette asked “why is there a lack of USFS support and what can he do about it?” This led into a spirited group discussion about the overall program of Accelerating Cooperative Riparian Restoration and Management.

BELIEFS AND BEHAVIORS

This recorded activity built upon the previous discussions, information sharing, and the earlier talk about the relationship of Beliefs and Behaviors to Strategies and Actions. The question to which people responded in the small groups was:

“What beliefs and behaviors must be addressed among all parties to achieve best possible outcomes?” [Note: The question does not assume negative or positive about the beliefs or behaviors.]

Collective Statement on Beliefs and Behaviors

Collective Statement: **“What beliefs and behaviors must be addressed among all parties to achieve the best possible outcomes?”**

All parties need to believe that healthy riparian ecosystems benefit everyone. It’s not just a fuzzy, tree hugging, feel-good thing to do. They must understand the benefits of making changes in their behavior if it is needed.

We all agree that it is worth doing, that it is a good thing to do. Maintain hope and encourage others, and the belief that PFC will lead to the best results for all users. *Change the perception that* PFC is the end point and replacement for hard data and the functioning condition rating is the reason to do something. *We need to move past the* management philosophy of “what can I get away with?” to “what can *I do to* improve and

enhance the riparian area?” *We need to* seek ways to build on what is working without losing sight of what did not work.

We value and recognize those who create or provide the positive environment where relationships flourish. Basic attitudes regarding resource use and management *should be recognized*. *We should* reduce hostility towards those that don’t share *our* same beliefs, or *not* impose personal beliefs on a decision.

Agencies need to drop the bunker mentality and environmental folks need to drop the idea of conflict as a fundraiser, and for landowners to open their operations for review. *We need to get away from* taking a win-lose approach *and that* conflicts can help us get dollars and membership. Assume you don’t understand rather than you do. Listen more and speak less. All parties must be allowed to be heard. We must use a common context for discussion and must see value in working to a common end. In meetings, discuss needs rather than positions.

Barriers that need to be cleared:

- One agency stands alone
- One person can evaluate a stream
- We can work on a solution in-house without the involvement of who it will affect.
- Looking at the riparian area in a vacuum.
- Working in a vacuum without interaction of other interested parties.
- We have to be perfect all the time.
- All streams have the same attributes
- We can’t afford the time to do the collaboration.
- Avoiding confrontation.
- We must address economic viability.
- Exclusion is the solution
- One’s social, financial, or training makes them more important to the group.
- That we are already collaborating.
- My values/beliefs are more moral/ethical than yours.
- Water, including management of riparian areas, is not a problem.
- Lack of attention/focus in dealing with riparian areas.
- Behavior through wanting PFC to achieve DFC.

Empire Building must stop!

Everybody is part of the problem and the solution. We all live in the watershed *where* common goals, opinions, and outcomes are shared. We need to build trust amongst individuals, as examples landowners and within and between agencies. *We should* move from input to collaboration *and* from positions to interests. *We should use* consensus to seek a common outcome, using a common language, agreed upon by all parties, recognizing that form follows function with an agreed upon dispute resolution mechanism.

Collaboration between agencies, different levels within agencies, and between agencies and the public must be implemented and not just given lip service, eh. Riparian restoration is more than just an “ologist” thing. *We need to change the belief* that collaboration will not result in an improvement *and realize that the group* [stakeholders and scientists] is wiser than any individual. In order to understand the reason behind the response, *we need to understand* the positive and negative beliefs and behaviors that arise from a particular topic being discussed, no matter how far out (dude). *We* recognize the value and importance of education and outreach, and locally led watershed-based planning and collaboration. *We should* move from technology transfer to relationship building.

Management must provide support for the process. *There is* a belief that there is a lack of buy-in at the manager level.

The belief/behavior that we need money and support to do the job must change. But on the other hand we need more money. We can only focus on a few priority initiatives and everything else is taken off your plate.

Proper functioning riparian areas are the least acceptable condition and input from all parties is needed to define the DFC we want from those areas. *There is* a belief that someone else will fix it. *There is* a behavior of the tragedy of the commons; use it or abuse it before someone else does.

We need to develop a belief that there is a need and benefit to improving watershed and riparian conditions. *We need to* develop an attitude that we each have a stake and responsibility in making needed changes. There is a niche for everything and filling the niche completes the ecosystem. *We need to* find the niche for cooperative accelerated riparian management. Soil, water and people are our most important resources.

Get to know Mother Nature again!

NEW AND ADAPTIVE STRATEGIES AND ACTIONS

At this point, we began stretching our thinking about the potential types of things that could help move the initiative forward, to achieve the best possible outcomes. The question introduced several new concepts that had not been discussed, or at least not very much. This caused some frustration among some of the groups; and it was purposeful.

Collective Statement on New and Adaptive Strategies and Actions

Collective Statement: **“What new and adaptive strategies and actions could successfully engage both agencies and publics AND meet requirements of laws and regulations?”**

Collaboration/Partnerships

Believe in and support the power of collective knowledge. Solicit participation and input by spending time to personally become acquainted with a diversity of publics and to

personally invite their involvement. Encourage long-term relationship building efforts prior to collaboration on projects. Focus efforts on helping the public, organizations, etc., to understand agency processes, policy, etc. (i.e., make it easier to work w/agencies). State and federal agencies need to empower locals to find solutions to implement TMDL's on private and public lands in response to lawsuits in 30 States. *There is a lack of trust w/Feds, get publics involved.*

We need to continue to reach out to our non-traditional constituents; and introduce them to PFC. Target county commissioners to attend our workshops. Think beyond the green curtain, take PFC to the most unlikely places and people we can think of. Give cooperative riparian restoration to the urban public. *We need* a liaison or rep @ large sports store, expos, public events. We need non-federally sponsored solicitation of private entities. Work to get non-government sponsors for collaborative process. Develop community-based coalitions that would prepare, I guess, uh, collaborative management and action plan open to revision and amendment.

Treat riparian areas as a commodity and adopt methods from successful private business to improve them. Shut off all computers one other day//month, spend that day communicating and educating. Develop multidisciplinary/multi-group representation task force to work w/Congressional appointed committee to gain support and emphasize the accelerated cooperative riparian restoration to meet the Unified Federal Policy and CWA.

Watershed Based Approach

We need an all-encompassing (i.e., area, resources, and participants) full watershed analysis, planning, implementation and evaluation process. It should be locally-led, where everyone in the watershed is pulled together to address things in a holistic manner. Such an integrated, collaborative, watershed-based approach allows for full involvement in the development of DFC's, and could meet ESA, CWA, NEPA requirements. This could reduce individual (and sometimes conflicting) analyses at the project/activity/agency level. Specific ideas include: a) identify successful projects and provide rewards/grants, b) participate in a local watershed effort, c) spend 1 day/month in the watershed, d) realign agency boundaries with large-scale watershed boundaries (e.g., FS districts) and e) provide coordination and technology transfer through a neutral entity (e.g., state head of CRMP). **WE NEED TO DO IT!**

In-House Training and Strategies

Each of us can incorporate the social element into cooperative riparian restoration and management. *We should* Tie (quantify and explain) other "hot button" issues to PFC –Why should you use it? Examples, noxious weeds, fire, water, etc. Change the workshops to be accelerating cooperative riparian work to provide more social stuff. *We need to* provide social science and communications training to agency 'ologists as well as managers. Make sure everyone with the office/agency is in agreement and supports the process before involving the public. If we can't sell it among ourselves, we won't sell it outside. *We should* design a new, creative award/recognition program for measured

success (for example, a combo agency-landowner award). Using stakeholder input, evaluate a manager's performance based on his/her efforts at collaboration.

Use Existing Tools

We need to apply the tools and processes we have. Instead of new and adaptive, expand on what we are already doing. I don't think we need new tools and strategies. Nothing is really new; we need to recycle and re-emphasize what has worked in the past, e.g., focus on Accelerated Cooperative Riparian Restoration and Management (ACRRM) rather than PFC as the "endpoint". PFC should be used as one of the tools to promote understanding to meet ACCRM. Recognize and use 9-step area wide planning process which integrates NEPA's CEA procedure. Constitutionally enshrine protection of ecosystem function, then leave it up to courts and people to decide what it means.

Public Education

Each person in this room and in the riparian coordination network *should be* talking to everyone they know about what makes this initiative important and different. *We should* have more people available to help with things that the NRST does now. Implement mandatory courses in qualitative field-based ecology from K-12 and for all undergraduates in each year of study. The program of philosophy (Critical Thinking Skills) for children should be mandatory for all K-12 schools receiving any public resources. Adopt ideas developed in the TV program "Survivor". Select 5 water catchment areas worldwide each year – "drop off" diverse group per catchment for 2 months each.

Policy

There is a need to build a national strategy; as an example, the national fire plan, utilizing local to national interests to improve and protect water quality and quantity. *Our* policy should be built around the basic hydrological model for continent; debit and credit models. As it now exists is not adequate to maintain basic connections among systems, communities, etc. *We should* adapt methods that make NEPA and FACA activity friendly through their adaptive interpretation *and* open up the Section 7 Consultation process. *There is a need to* identify one Federal Cabinet Secretary as the specific individual and agency responsible for fresh water. *They will* implement with meaning and intent the Unified Federal Policy *by, among other things,* release of 5% of each individual's budget allocation for discretionary expenditure *and* a Farm Bill – style payment for maintaining streams in PFC. *Finally,* encourage user groups, i.e., Cattlemen, wildlife, fish, Sierra Club, etc., etc., to seek ear-marked Congressional appropriations supporting multiple, interagency teams to assist local watershed groups to reach consensus on sustainable management and restoration strategies in an ecosystem context.

.....

***Facilitator Insight** – While there was considerable discussion and frustration about dealing with this broad question, some good information came out which became much more refined as we went on. The purpose of this overly broad question, with new terms

such as “new and adaptive”, and the concept of engaging the publics AND meet laws, etc., was to push the group beyond its normal thinking.

I referred to this as the **Vanna White Effect**, or the creation of a blank space in the brain. As humans, we simply can’t stand having unfilled spaces. The example of the missing space was done by **B_D**. There are few people who can look at that arrangement of two letters and a blank without trying to fill it in. Likewise, when people are asked to do things they’ve not thought of before, or in that context, it creates a missing space that often takes their thinking to a higher level. If you want to try something interesting with your employees, peers, supervisor, family, or other, ask them a question to which they probably don’t have an answer.

Ex. “What do we need to do to bring back the salmon?”

Normal Answer: “I don’t know”, or “It’s impossible to bring back the salmon”

Your response: “I understand that you don’t know (or that it’s impossible), but if you DID know, (or if it WAS possible), how would you do it?”

I’ve done this in a lot of different situations, and you’d be amazed at how many times people just move right ahead and start talking about the things they’d do. It is essential to acknowledge that they don’t know, or that the task is impossible. It allows them to move beyond that possibility, and to engage our brain at the next level. It can be powerful in grappling with conflicts!

SHORT TERM ACTIONS AND LONG TERM STRATEGIES

From the “global” look at potential strategies and actions, the group worked on devising time frames and refining of the earlier suggestions. The questions were both answered, and then reported out by all groups.

Collective Statement on Short Term Actions

Collective Statement: **“What specific short term actions do you recommend to accelerate cooperative riparian restoration on an interagency and community basis?”**

Education

Develop and distribute lesson plans for high school and universities including professionally produced video. Also, support graduate research that directly supports initiative. Go into a high school, select a dozen kids to play the role that their parents would play to develop long term actions. Then you would meet with the parents to see what their kids have done. Then have the parents involve the publics and do the same thing. (Kids would stimulate their parents)

Develop a mentoring program, have people in a mentoring pipeline that can join cadres as others move/retire. Have more required training for all managers. Spend a day with a rancher or a farmer. Require continuing education for those purporting to be a

resource manager and pay for it. Create an on-line plant id base. Teach ACCR at local college level

Focus on developing common understanding, goals and objectives within and between agencies and the community (PFC). Provide training to public agencies and private organizations in the 9-step area wide planning process and various financial programs (eg, CREP, CRP) in preparation for community/stakeholder planning. Engage a non-fed entity (extension agent) to pitch PFC philosophy. Invite City Council and County Commissioners to your next PFC session. Give as many 1-day introductory PFC classes as possible to diverse groups.

Agency Commitment – Management Support

Build management support at all management levels, but I don't know how to do that. (maybe tools to sell them.) *We need* Out reach to agency leadership. *Need a* Statement from agency leads that ACCR is an important facet of their program. Return home and get definitive support for the process – i.e, get it in writing. Implementing the strategy will be a part of every manager's performance evaluation. Reward those that do it, punish those that don't. Encourage/coerce line officers and managers to attend PFC workshops.

Engage other federal agencies currently not involved (NPS, COE, FWS, BOR, etc.)

Have another workshop with more participation of the consulting agencies (eg, NMFS). The USFS should integrate the strategy into all resource program areas, specifically including the fish and wildlife programs. Develop a working agreement with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and NMFS, providing for their recognition and participation in the process. Develop interagency commitment and approach under the Unified Federal Policy to implement TMDL's.

Ensure continued maintenance of existing activities; wherever practical, seek additional resources to expand present activities, and influence future supporters of ACRR & M. Members of the riparian coordination network: 1) determine your organizations or agencies commitment to riparian restoration (i.e., who's available, how much time, level of funding, etc. they're willing to commit.) 2) Determine who is interested in the community, 3) determine approach agreeable to the group for riparian restoration.

Each of us take 1 day/week and devote it to promoting Accelerated Cooperative Riparian Restoration.

Funding

All 3 agencies should fund the cadres – it doesn't take that much. Develop integrated + ID funding and assessment group. Direct \$ for travel/salary for cadre members. D.C. needs to give \$, not just demand that they do it. Provide funding for state cadre, get everyone's support.

Communication – Marketing

Communicate the results of this & other workshops to our internal and external audiences. Brief new administration on the Initiative and utilities of PFC tool. Increase communication between cadres. Develop PSA for television, radio and newspapers, magazines, etc.

We need a marketing plan. Develop a briefing on what the ACRR&M initiative, including PFC< really “ buys”; for CWA, CRP/CREP, ESA, NEPA, AFO’s and EQIP. Develop a succinct description of PFC.

Partnerships

Identify all the stakeholders and those who have an interest in riparian restoration on a basin scale. Partner w/ interest groups, i.e., TU, CCA, etc., to sponsor workshop to educate their members. Share power and responsibility. Participate in a cooperative delineation of 5th and 6th level HUC’s and start a collaborative process with agencies and communities for determining priority watersheds. Be able to provide refreshments when you invite the community to your house. Identify the “value-added” of ACRR&M and communicate that to 2 other people. Identify the purpose for PFC (i.e., why do it, what does it buy down the road). Interview a cross section of the community to see what their views are on the situation, how did it get that way and how do they feel about it?

Change emphasis from PFC assessment to collaborative issue identification and possible solutions. Contact all potential groups to attend short informative meeting about the health of their water. Open house for newest plan of action.

Success Stories

Provide central clearinghouse for support materials and add many success stories to website. Acknowledge and expand what’s already working – while moving east and internationally. Pick a watershed and get something started! Put a group together and go fix a creek with a willing landowner. Do it again. Post images we can use in presentation on the website.

.....

Collective Statement on Long Term Strategies

Collective Statement: “What longer term strategies and actions should also be undertaken to insure success of the total mission across the United States and beyond?

Sustainable Cadres

After we get everyone’s support we need to keep everyone’s support and be prepared for turnover and retirement. *We also need to* promote apprenticeships to assure continuity and replacement staff. Mentor future riparian leaders *and for the need for* a team to teach riparian vegetation using Al’s reference.

Reorganize and expand the existing infrastructure that is necessary and complimentary for the initiative. Build the beliefs and behaviors related to the importance and role of ACRRM into the culture of the agencies.

Funding

Use USDA EQIP to fund the private landowner participants in watershed training, planning, implementation and cost sharing emphasizing watersheds with impacted riparian and water resources. Ensure multi-year funding of community *watershed* based plans. Involve media to showcase watersheds across America that are being worked on (PSA's, PBS, etc.)

Work with congress, administration, and agencies on long-term funding focused on riparian restoration and management. Increase support to existing state cadres. *Consider a* separate funding source, maybe move ACRR outside government *and* create PFC, Inc. Tie federal dollars to stewardship payments rather than price supports. Also give income tax deductions for implementing BMP's.

Partners

Dissolve legal boundaries within watersheds, only results count:

- 1) **Put together a group with a willing landowner, fix a creek;**
- 2) **Do it again!! With partners.**

Develop long-term partnership support *by* joining successful watershed councils to create an interconnected network, e.g., Chesapeake Bay.

Planning/Process

Institute a universal, large area, adaptive planning process for use by public and private organizations administered by States. Move land management planning processes to follow ecosystem analysis at the watershed scale. Explore how Accelerating Cooperative Riparian Restoration can be included in watershed planning and management. (Interagency/community approach) Develop a strategy and management plan to assess, restore, and evaluate ecological health while ensuring BOTH ecological and economic viability.

Marketing

We need a marketing plan. Develop and implement a marketing and education plan aimed at all of the interest groups and the general public. Develop and implement a long-term communication plan that accesses a wider audience *including* urban. Develop some system-wide CRM examples and use them for marketing, communication and education. Share success stories that inspire others to action. Develop a strategy paper, maybe as Unified Federal Programs implementation that shows examples of application of ACRM/PFC incorporated into other programs to demonstrate linkages and value added. We will need a new leader when Wayne retires.

Education

It's Education, Stupid! Education, education, education. Develop education programs for grade, high and college level. Develop a national education plan that emphasizes the importance of healthy riparian areas. Teach children how streams work. Incorporate ecology into all levels of school curriculum. Develop an education program for elementary schools about fresh water. Include info and activities about conservation,

water uses, riparian areas, etc. Continue the education process by developing fresh approaches, especially in primary and secondary schools. Develop a training module for use in high schools. Educate college and university students in cooperative management. Work with universities and colleges to develop a cooperative riparian restoration and management curriculum.

Engage a “McPhee – Chas. Wilkinson – Nevada Barr” author to write a popular work that describes the human side of riparian resources. Work w/CA education foundation to develop riparian materials.

Continental – International

Include a bilingual (Spanish/French) on NRST. *Convene* an international symposium/congress on water issues. Develop some international symposia to share this information.

Get a corporate sponsor to help expand international outreach (i.e., Africa, China). Identify the potential and capability to train non-Americans in PFC and ACCRM, in-situ. Participate in international riparian forums. Develop some cross-border examples. Train international agency staffs in PFC and ACCRM. *Provide* funding and training for cadres across the globe. Create a Peace Corps analog called Aquacorps. Design an international ion for water, i.e., Wayne the Water Drop.

Establish state and regional interagency teams to work on PFC, TMDL’s, etc., with agencies and watershed groups. Broaden *the* initiative by establishing regional teams and an additional NRST to represent the east coast and central U.S. Develop an eastern Riparian Service Team based at an eastern college/university. Assist in establishing cadres across the U.S.

Other Important Ideas

We need a Cabinet level Secretary responsible for fresh water, as well as commitment and support from NRCS. Ban lawyers from Congress. Adapt PFC into a GIS application. Take advantage of stream gauges and internet technology to make information widely and quickly available.

Groups were assigned to do collective statements, and the meeting ended for the day. That evening, we had **an OUTSTANDING presentation by our friends from Canada** about the successes they are having adapting PFC and the Initiative work to urban environments. This was one of the highlights of the meeting for many people!

***Insight:** The shared with us, that to be successful, requires that they devote approximately 80% of their time to the social human/social dimensions of this work.

Thursday, May 17:

Collective Statement Review – Careful listening was urged, as we were going to use the provided information to move toward our final set of outcomes.

Large Talking Circle – Several people around the large circle were asked to synthesize and comment on what they had heard in the reading of the collective statement, looking for areas of agreement, key points, however they chose to describe it. Following this, each person around the circle was given the opportunity to comment on the same aspects and where the work needed to go. Excellent insights were provided.

Small Group Breakout – Final Activities on Actions and Strategies - The first question asked of the group was about the short term, drawing on all the work we had done, and the insights in the previous talking circle.

Collective Statement: **“Based on the collective statements and discussion, what are the critical actions that we support as a group to take in the near term to help our creeks and communities?”**

Strengthening The Network Efforts

Work with interagency and publics to begin (*the initiative*) again. Keep up the good work. Build on existing tools. Preserve existing momentum of using PFC to effect ACRRM and Ensure quality control to minimize assessment errors. Do whatever is necessary to make sure the NRST continues and expand its sphere of influence. *Use a* Unified planning process and vocabulary. For agencies: discuss integration of the ACRRM with watershed management. Identify opportunities to integrate accelerated watershed and riparian improvement into ongoing and emerging initiatives, i.e., fire, clean water. Provide info to managers of program successes.

Do what’s needed to get each state cadre what they need so that part of the “education” continues. Begin to move toward satellite groups to national team. Start with fire overhead team model as method of implementation. Develop technical/people (*collaborative people?*) groups to help and assist development and implementation of local plans. Develop a mentoring program for NRST. Mentor apprentices. Meet w/State and regional contacts to review new action items of the ACRRM to gain buy-in at the local level by 7/31.

Forest Service - Provide support for FS employees to be active members of State cadres. Provide funding so we can just go out and DO IT! Each person go home and duplicate Sandy Wyman’s success in getting \$1/2 million riparian project started on the Big Sioux River using 319 funds.

Collaboration

Reach out to managers, user groups and local watershed groups by building relationships, providing education and demonstrating a willingness to listen. Reach out and invite/involve new partners as a part of the initiative. Emphasize education, communication, and collaboration. 1) Go the extra mile to involve mgt. in the ACRR, 2) then repeat w/public, 3) repeat #2. *Do* Community education, relationship building within the community. Become part of your community both locally and @ the level of your work. Build personal community relationships. Continue working with local watershed councils completing projects, creating budgets & working with local teachers. Get a group, do something. Go home and call the person you least want to talk to about riparian health. Build partnerships, stupid.

Develop interagency/interest group coalitions to discuss collaborative efforts to maintain or receive buy-in from agency heads by Sept. 1. *We should* Coordinate with F&WS, NMFS and make them a partner in the process. *I will* Work with my counterparts in BLM, FWS, NMFS, NRCS to develop strategies to just do it. Refresh (*remind?*) ID team, resource folks and management that riparian areas are still a focus and collaborative efforts with communities must be maintained.

Communication and Marketing

Focus the discussion from this workshop into a do-able action plan with emphasis to on-the-ground results. Inform as many people as possible *about* the outcomes of this meeting. Synthesize meeting information and help carry action items forward.

Develop/refine a long term communications strategy for the ACRRM to reach our internal and external audiences. Develop a national marketing strategy for ACRRM. *Develop a* Marketing plan for expanding NRST & State cadre for ACRR. Assist by packaging the work being done on an existing project that incorporates a variety of initiatives and tools to be used for communication and marketing. Showcase success stories. *Do* Education and stick with program, Education: internal and external. . Develop an international workshop/symposium on ACRRM. Engage at local level to explain importance of cooperative, accelerated riparian restoration and management.

Keep spreading the word of ACRRM and PFC via workshops targeted toward private landowners, umm, that's fine. Move toward education of different groups about ACRRM/watersheds. Tell yourself that you can do it.

Watershed Approach

Coordinate watershed restoration efforts. Work at the watershed level at a spatial and societal scale. Think and plan at the watershed scale, Taking action on ACWR on a local level.

Other

I recommend That each person do what Russ did: Decide what we as individuals can do first on a broad scale, and secondly on a local scale to further A.C.R/WR&M. Do a Russ LaFayette.

.....

The final question dealt with the longer-term future of the Initiative.

Collective Statement: **“What longer term strategies/actions does this group believe will help people nationally and globally to ‘keep our water on the land longer?’”**

Program Future

There is a need to provide continued assistance to make sure that the program continues and to expand activities geographically. There is a need to continue and (increase) state cadres, Move to east U.S. (state cadres, regional teams, & additional NRST in east/central U.S. Continue to broaden the NRST outreach to urban and international audiences. Move the concept of riparian health to the urban areas both nationally and globally. Develop large, corporate partners to fund work, education, etc., i.e., Chrysler, General Foods, etc.

Develop an interagency apprenticeship program in collaborative watershed management. Mentor new people/potential replacements.

Education

Education – we need to emphasize our freshwater vulnerability and our ties to the watershed. Educate, educate, educate. Develop an education plan, education and marketing. Develop *an* education and marketing plan. Develop a marketing plan. Ensure that watershed restoration is seen as a politically hot topic. *We need a* concerted intergovernmental, international education effort. Participate in education and conservation efforts with a water emphasis.

Develop modules and materials to educate our youth about watershed health and riparian values. Reach out to a younger audience: remember the BLM contracted out for a riparian tool kit for grades 5-8. It is in a second draft stage. Develop & integrate a K-12 curriculum on riparian management. Develop a comprehensive education approach for K-12 that models the process. *Note: Larry Schmidt indicated he intends to develop this K-12 model, using an existing model from Australia as a starting point*) Develop and investigate web clearinghouse on education programs and materials (short term?). Work with universities and colleges to develop a curriculum on cooperative riparian restoration management with emphasis on the social and relationship side of the strategy.

Educate and collaborate. Ingrain watershed restoration in the social psyche.

Restore a REAL connection to the land and personal responsibility to it as opposed to the Discovery Channel Syndrome. Take every opportunity to discuss the importance of freshwater resources with peers, friends, acquaintances, and family. Educate the public, in general, how a properly functioning stream collects, stores and slowly release water.

Education of others of the importance of healthy catchments showcasing local successes and coaching others on Accelerated Cooperative Catchment Restoration *will help*.

Dealing With The Global Crisis

Economic stability precedes ecological stability. Bring population stabilization and education to the fore of political and social discussions @ all levels (local to global). Help meet basic human needs – food, clothing, shelter. Participate in international forums. Promote aquatic ecology as a basis for foreign aid.

Target economic and culturally appropriate opportunities. Promote literacy. Promote effective, efficient, affordable technology such as Coke bottle disinfections. { KISS }

Fund NRST travel to non-American countries to understand constraints and capabilities, and characterize Leopold's water budget/deficit concept (W.E. is correct). Globally, become familiar with all existing efforts by governments, NGO's, UN, Peace Corps, etc. Find out their missions and activities and develop and implement ways of befriending, assisting, and partnering with them. Promote Aqua Corps concept.

Collaboration

Actively seek out watershed group efforts to interface w/ and participate in. “go to them” ---> join other agency/groups meetings to develop partnerships and collaborative actions. Engage the social science research cadre in evaluating and critiquing the process. Enhance the education/training offered by agencies and NRST to provide more social science and collaboration tools.

Watershed Management

We should feature ACR/WRM that is watershed based with modular implementation. A goal is Watershed management that leaves more vegetation at a higher ecological status on uplands and riparian areas, Conservation of water resources and vegetation. Legislate watershed inventory and restoration as a primary purpose in natural resource agencies. Do something on the ground.

Economic Viability

Work to insure Economic viability of resource industries.

P = Partnerships

F = Friends and Families

C = Community

Economic viability of restoration is important.

Other Thoughts

Rethink the attitude of some within FS of cutting down trees to provide municipal, irrigation and industrial water. Recognize the inherent conflict between agriculturists and engineers (hydro) who desire to get water off the land quickly – and aquatic “ologists” who seek the reverse. In Five years, we import Canadian effort that we exported in the '90, prophet/own country.

Report Out – Both the near term and longer term actions were reported to the group.

Closing – Each person was provided the opportunity to answer the following two questions:

“How did you feel about the meeting?”

“Give one sentence that describes what you will do with what you’ve learned during this meeting.”